

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### REAFFIRMING LONGSTANDING UNITED STATES POLICY IN SUP- PORT OF A DIRECT BILAT- ERALLY NEGOTIATED SETTLE- MENT OF THE ISRAELI-PALES- TINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

**HON. GWEN MOORE**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 29, 2016*

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and chairman for their hard work in crafting this resolution. It reiterates a number of points consistent with longstanding U.S. policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including the current Administration, that I support. It is still to be seen what this policy will look like under the new Administration.

No one disputes the need for the parties to directly work out the issues. I articulated that position in a letter I sent to President Obama when he took office in 2009. I reaffirmed that position again in a letter to the President about a year ago. I continue to support that position.

Additionally, no one disputes the need to oppose unilateral actions by either party that undermines the process. As Vice President BIDEN noted earlier this year, "Actions on either side to undermine trust only take us further away from the path of peace. Actions like at the U.N. to undermine Israel, or . . . settlement activities." Such actions clearly erode the prospect of a two-state solution, the stated goal for U.S. policy and efforts for a number of years now.

However, I believe that this resolution we are debating is incomplete.

For example, this resolution should not be mischaracterized or misrepresented as opposing constructive steps by the United States, either unilaterally or with the international community, to help preserve and further a negotiated two-state solution between the Israelis and Palestinians.

While no effort can replace the parties themselves reaching agreement, there are a host of ways in which the U.S. and other stakeholders in the international communities, like Arab countries in the region, with a vital interest in peace can support steps to rebuild trust and good will, both of which are sorely lacking and will be needed. It must be made clear that Congress is not discouraging such efforts through this or any other resolution.

The framework for a resolution to the conflict has long been clear for a number of years and formulated a number of times, including President Clinton and President George W. Bush. No U.N. resolution is needed for that.

The issue isn't whether we know where the major issues of disagreement lie, but how to create an environment that encourages the parties to move forward. The U.S. and international support can be helpful and useful to building that environment. It would be foolhardy to hope that somehow the Israelis and

Palestinians spontaneously decide to stop pointing fingers and come together and find solutions to some very tough and challenging issues.

The challenges to peace at the moment are tremendous which is why it is important that we should encourage all interested in peace to continue to work for it.

Even Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu recently expressed appreciation for and a willingness to build on multilateral and regional efforts regarding the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians, such as the Arab Peace Initiative.

At the end of his Administration, President George W. Bush held a conference at Annapolis where he hosted the leaders of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, but also other "nations that support a two-state solution, reject violence, recognize Israel's right to exist, and commit to all previous agreements between the parties." President Bush also noted that "the world can do more to build the conditions for peace" between the two parties. The U.S. invited 49 countries and international organizations to participate including Members of the Arab League, Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council, and the International Quartet for Middle East Peace.

In 2007, President George W. Bush argued for the international community to "rise to the moment, and provide decisive support to responsible Palestinian leaders working for peace" and laid out one role for the international community—helping create viable Palestinian institutions necessary for a state.

Former Senator and head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Richard Lugar repeatedly noted that "Both Israel and the Palestinians urgently need international support to fortify their ability and willingness to embrace the difficult choices that will be necessary" to reach a peace deal.

While the world has changed much since that time, the need for the international community to do more to "build conditions for peace" between the two parties has not diminished.

Yet, I am concerned that some may read H. Con. Res. 165 as dismissing all efforts by the U.S. to engage the international community to galvanize broad support for meaningful efforts to move the parties towards peace.

I also want to emphasize that no one should read this resolution as preventing the U.S. from supporting non-binding efforts through the U.N. Security Council to further progress toward a negotiated, conflict-ending agreement. This has long been a part of the U.S. Middle East Peace toolbox.

The U.S. was instrumental in drafting and passing UNSC Resolutions 242 (in 1967) and 338 (in 1973) outlining the international community's desire for a peaceful resolution to the Arab-Israeli conflict through territorial compromise. Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have previously worked through the U.N. Security Council to promote peace.

Under President Reagan, the United States did not veto U.N. Security Council Resolutions

criticizing Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights and its activities in the occupied Palestinian territories.

I believe that such efforts remain a viable tool today.

That doesn't mean the U.S. has to support efforts it believes are contrary to peace. It has long been U.S. policy to denounce actions by any party—Israel, the Palestinians, or international actors—that are unwelcomed. This includes opposition to actions by the United Nations—or any other entity—to pass resolutions that are one-sided or anti-Israel. And the Obama Administration has done so when needed.

Additionally, I believe the resolution would have been strengthened by strongly emphasizing that there is no workable alternative to the two-state solution which has been the focus of U.S. peacemaking efforts for years now.

Lastly, I continue to support the current Administration's push for peace between our allies and to urge it to continue to do so even in its waning days. I also urge the incoming Administration to work constructively towards a two-state solution. In a recent poll, 69 percent of American Jewish voters expressed support for President Barack Obama delivering a major speech before leaving office outlining a vision for what Israelis and Palestinians must do to reach a peace agreement.

There is plenty of blame to apportion for why the status quo of violence, instability, and conflict continues unabated.

We owe it to every Israeli and Palestinian who share a vision of two peoples living side by side in peace and security to never quit on working toward a meaningful peace and that should include pursuing every tool and leveraging every ally in that pursuit.

### TRIBUTE TO DAVID JOHNSON, CO- FOUNDER OF POLARIS INDUS- TRIES

**HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, December 1, 2016*

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a visionary business man from my district, David Johnson. He co-founded Polaris Industries and designed its first snowmobile.

While Mr. Johnson was in the Navy he invested half of his paycheck . . . just \$11 after he received a letter from his friend asking for help. When he returned home after his military service Mr. Johnson went to work for the company.

The company he helped found reached its first billion-dollar sales year in 1995. It now generates over \$4 billion in sales yearly and has a major impact on the local economy.

Despite retiring in 1988, Mr Johnson was a regular fixture at the company's Roseau, Minnesota plant, which is in my district. He would

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.